

Scripture

THE QUARTERLY OF THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION

VOLUME VI

April 1954

No 4

EDITORIAL

The Annual General Meeting of the Association took place at the Newman Centre, 31 Portman Square, London W1, on Thursday, 7 January at 6 p.m.

The Secretary read a report for the year 1953. The long-awaited *Catholic Commentary*, he said, was published on 5 February by Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd, Edinburgh. To mark the event, the publishers gave a reception in London at the Challoner Club, to which many prominent people, ecclesiastical and lay, were invited. A specially bound copy of the *Commentary* was presented to His Eminence the Cardinal by the General Editor, Dom Bernard Orchard. The first printing of the *Commentary* was sold out well before the end of the year, and the first American printing was also sold out, soon afterwards. Arrangements were being made for translating the *Commentary* into other languages. The next important event during the year was the publication of *Scripture* by Nelsons, beginning with the July number. Though some increase in price was inevitable, this should be offset by greater circulation and greater efficiency in production. The same publishers, he said, had also undertaken to publish the C.B.A. textbooks *Old Testament for Schools* Grades I and II, and these should appear shortly. Some further delay must elapse before Grade III was ready for the press. An entirely new series of textbooks for the higher forms of schools, and indeed for the educated layman, was in preparation, something on the lines of the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*. The Gospels and *Acts* would be published in (five) separate volumes and a few of the more important O.T. books were also in preparation. The editors of the series were Dom Bernard Orchard and the Rev. R. C. Fuller, and the publishers would be Nelsons. The lecture course on the N.T. at the Newman Centre finished in March, and the three-year Scripture-cycle began again in October with the O.T. The number in attendance had so far been rather better than the previous year.

At the conclusion of the Secretary's report the Treasurer's statement was read, for the year ending 30 September 1953. This statement is printed overleaf.

RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 1953

RECEIPTS

To Balance at 1 October 1952

Westminster Bank
Post Office Savings Bank

£31 13 3
61 13 8

Subscriptions:

Current year
Prior years
Future years
Life Membership

£206 0 7
42 0 8
14 8 11
61 0 0

£323 10 2

Donations

3 19 6

Sales of Publications

Advertisements in *Scripture*

Interest on Post Office Savings Bank Account

327 9 8

45 14 11
21 5 0
1 10 6

£489 7 0

PAYMENTS

By Printing, Stationery and Publications

Fees for Contributions

Honorarium to Treasurer

Bank Charges

Postage and Incidentals

£93 6 11

Balances at 30 September 1953

Westminster Bank

Post Office Savings Bank

Cash in Hand

£88 16 7
63 4 2
9 10

152 10 7

£299 5 1
10 7 0
20 0 0
2 6 7
4 17 9

REPORT OF THE AUDITOR TO THE MEMBERS OF THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION

I have examined the above Receipts and Payments Account and certify that it is in accordance with the books and records of the Association and the explanations given to me.

1/4 Broad Street Place, London EC2

22 December 1953

M. B. BROWNE

Chartered Accountant

Grundy MacGowan and Browne

EDITORIAL

Father Sutcliffe suggested that more books should be bought for the C.B.A. Lending Library and that lists of accessions should be published in *Scripture*. Furthermore, the Library should be made known to a wider public. Professor Coppens, of Louvain University, whom the Chairman welcomed as a visitor to the meeting, then said a few words on Bible study in Belgium. Referring to last year's meeting, another member said that the Douay Version of the Bible was not readily available to Catholics today. The editions were too expensive, and often the paper was too thin and the binding too weak. Since there was still a demand for the Douay Version it was again asked if the C.B.A. could produce an edition of it, or if the Association could persuade a publisher to produce a good edition of it on strong paper and in a strong binding. Another member asked if a popular though scientific life of Christ could be produced and published in the Pelican Books, to offset such works as Cadoux's *Life of Jesus*.

At the end of the Business Meeting, Dr Fuller read a short paper on *The Trial of Jesus Christ*, and this was followed by an interesting discussion.

THE ORIGIN OF ST MARK'S GOSPEL

A New Theory

The association of the primitive Christian calendar with the making of the Marcan Gospel, suggested by the title and sub-title of a recent work,¹ is likely to attract attention. Experience has taught that the genesis of our Gospels forms a tangled problem which makes a help such as is rendered by the author in his study of this particular side of the question but too welcome. In the first part (Introduction, pp. 3-113) he explains how his theory was gradually built up, and he guides his readers through a complicated series of arguments and supporting indications. The second part (pp. 115-230) presents the text of St Mark's Gospel, arranged according to the chapter-numbering of the Codex Vaticanus (B), with informative introductions and notes for every lection.

The liturgical theory advanced by the author is as follows: "The Gospel consists of a series of lections for use in the Christian *ecclesia* on the successive Sundays of the year, and of a longer continuous lection which was used on the annual solemnity of the Pascha (Passover) at which the Passion was commemorated" (p. xi). "Consists of" means here that the Gospel was actually composed for this liturgical purpose. However, it was not with the intention of proving this that the author undertook the research which resulted in the present publication. The attention of the author had been drawn by the saying of Jesus: "Unto you is given the Mystery of the Kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all things are done in parables" (Mk. iv.11); and the original aim of his investigation was to find out the key to that "Mystery". He discovered that there is a connexion between the Seed Parables, the Feeding of the Five Thousand, the Feeding of the Four Thousand and the Confession at Caesarea Philippi, preceding the Transfiguration. Since the Feeding of the Four Thousand may be regarded as a doublet of the Feeding of the Five Thousand and accordingly may be put aside for the moment, three events are left that appear to form parts of three more or less corresponding literary cycles grouped around or connected with a calling or withdrawal from the world to a mountain. These three cycles or "Mountains" turn out to be three stages of the Mystery: ". . . the death and resurrection of the Son of Man is announced in

¹ Philip Carrington, Archbishop of Quebec, *The primitive Christian Calendar: a study in the making of the Marcan Gospel*, vol. 1, Cambridge University Press 1952. Pp. xvi + 236. 30s net.

parables after the events of the First Mountain, enacted sacramentally at the Second Mountain, and revealed 'openly' at the Third Mountain" (p. 8). The Mystery is the death and resurrection of the Son of Man. The Three "Mountains" and the Three Passion Announcements (Mk. III.7-X.45), two overlapping "triads",¹ form obviously the core of what is called the "Galilean Gospel".

The bridge to the liturgical theory was built when after some time the idea entered the mind of the author that there might be a relation between the Galilean Gospel and the liturgical year. It may be regarded as quite natural that the liturgical year of the early Church was a continuation and development of the Hebrew liturgical year, with its cycle of agricultural-ritual festivals. An intentional relation between the Gospel and the liturgical calendar (i.e. that the Gospel was composed to provide lections for the liturgical year) would give a very simple solution, for instance, for the otherwise awkward doublet of the Feeding of the Five Thousand and the Feeding of the Four Thousand. The Feeding of the Five Thousand, which actually took place about Passover, could not have, as a Pascha-lection, a better counterpart for Pentecost, which was "little more than the completion of Passover" (p. 16), than the Feeding of the Four Thousand; and it happens that the Gospel supplies between Mk. VI.30-44 (the Feeding of the Five Thousand) and Mk. VIII.1-9 (the Feeding of the Four Thousand) exactly the material for six intermediate Sundays. A thorough literary analysis brought to light that the Gospel is divisible, without any difficulty, into the number of lections required for the liturgical year. With the Feeding of the Five Thousand for the Passover, the Feeding of the Four Thousand for Pentecost, the Transfiguration for the Midsummer-Festival and the Teaching of Jesus at Jerusalem for the Feast of Tabernacles, the first part of Mark (preceding the Passion) provides a cycle of lections for the liturgical year from autumn to autumn.

The hypothesis, thus far merely literary, received a welcome support when it was suggested to the author to include the chapter-divisions of the old manuscripts in the investigation. (Here are not meant the Ammonian sections and Eusebian canons but the other divisions which are found in most of the ancient manuscripts and indicated in the margin of Nestle's text edition.) Two systems can be distinguished: one found in the mass of the Greek manuscripts headed by the Codex Alexandrinus (A) and the other represented by the Codex Vaticanus (B)

¹ The author devotes special attention to "... the threefold pattern which ramifies through the whole gospel"; "A recognition of the triads is equivalent to a recognition of the structure of the gospel" (p. 9; cf. Appendix 2: Index of Major Triads, pp. 49 ff.; the minor triads are indicated in the notes to the lections).

and its followers. They are indicated by the author as the "B" and "non-B" systems, and he regards the former system as the older one, although he does not think that the original Marcan system has been preserved unaltered even in *B*. Mark's Gospel is divided in *B* into 62 chapters and this chapter-division appears to fit the liturgical theory far better than any system which our author had himself designed on literary grounds; 48 (or 49) of these 62 chapters provide lections for the annual cycle, whilst the remaining 14 (twice 7) chapters comprise the Passion narrative, viz. the Pascha-lection. Lection 49 is supposed to have had a double function as the last lection of the calendar year and the first lection of the Passion. The last lections of the year (43-8) were intended for the Feast of Tabernacles, and there is nothing in the text of these lections (Mk. x.46-xii.44) that does not fit in with this arrangement except the words: "... for it was not the season of figs" (Mk. xi.13), which induces the author to state: "We are bound, now, to suggest that it *was* the season of figs, and that these eight words are a gloss" (p. 27). Finally the author comes to the following outline of the Marcan year:

First half-year	Tishri(end) to Nisan 1	Lections 1-22 (Mk. i.1-vi.6)
Second half-year	Nisan 1 to Tishri 23	Lections 23-48 (Mk. vi.7-xii.44)
Passion narrative	Paschal Day	Lections 49-62 (Mk. xiii.1-xvi.8) (p. 32)

The surprising thing is that the Passion narrative does not begin at Mk. xiv.1 (as generally assumed) but at Mk. xiii.1, which includes the Discourse on the Mount of Olives. However, besides the chapter-enumeration there also occur in *B* script-divisions, that is to say, at certain intervals a line protrudes by one letter into the left-hand margin, sometimes preceded by a shorter line, thus clearly indicating the beginning of a new section. Such script-divisions are found after Mk. i.20, i.34, i.45, vi.6, ix.36, x.31, x.45 (doubtful on account of an error of the copyist who omitted the line in question which was inserted in the right-hand margin), xii.44. These do not always coincide with the chapter-divisions (cf. ix.36, x.31), which suggests an independent system, yet their occurrence at points marked as the main points in the chapter-system, after lection 22 (Mk. vi.6), lection 48 (Mk. xii.44) and perhaps after Mk. x.45 (lection 42), the final verse of the Galilean Gospel, provides a remarkable support to the established conclusions.

The 170-chapter system for Matthew in *B* is not of interest for the theory, but the non-*B* system gives 68 numbered chapters for Matthew (in fact 69 chapters, for the first chapter is numberless), 54(55) for the calendar year and 14 for the Pascha. The correspondence, lection by lection, between this system of Matthew and the *B*-system of Mark

is so extraordinarily close that "... there is only one possible inference. The composer of Matthew had before him a copy of Mark in the 62-chapter form, identical with, or closely resembling what we have in *B*, and arranged all his material to fit this plan" (p. 27). The seven lections which Matthew has more than Mark are not due, as might be expected, to the peculiar material of Matthew; they appear between the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem (Mk., lect. 44; Mt., lect. 45) and the Discourse on the Mount of Olives (Mk., lect. 49; Mt., lect. 57), and this confirms a previous supposition of the author, namely, that the lections for the Feast of Tabernacles were reduced from 14 to 7 in the *B*-system of Mark. Matthew used a copy which still had 14 lections at that place; he had before him a 69-lection copy of Mark. "The 62-lection Mark of *B* is a reduced form of the original 69-lection form as used by Matthew" (p. 28).

The manuscripts other than *B* have a shorter, condensed and undoubtedly younger system for Mark of 48(49) lections which appears to have been adapted to the Roman year (p. 36). Here again the Transfiguration has its place in connexion with the Summer-Solstice, and the whole system fits the Roman Calendar so well that "It almost looks as if the gospel were so planned as to make this secondary arrangement a possibility" (pp. 36 f.). This shorter non-*B* system is at the base of the 55-lection system found in the *Diatessaron* of Tatian as preserved for us in an eleventh-century Arabic translation from the Syriac. This brings us back to c. A.D. 170, for this development must have taken place before the *Diatessaron* was composed (completed before A.D. 173). The author summarises this development as follows: "The 62-lection Mark (or more probably its 69-lection ancestor) is the parent of the 68(69)-lection Matthew; it was at a later date condensed into the 48(49)-lection Mark, which was the ancestor of the 55-lection *Diatessaron*. The developments represented by these figures took place before Tatian composed his *Diatessaron* (A.D. 160-70); they were, indeed, completed and accepted in the Church before that date. This opinion is confirmed by the reflexion that they could only have taken place at a period when a single gospel had the dominant liturgical position in the Church; indeed the composing of the *Diatessaron* was a belated effort to save the principle underlying the one-gospel system.

"We are inclined to think, however, that the whole series of figures and facts can only be explained by the hypothesis that the process to which they bear witness is as old as the gospels themselves" (pp. 30 f.).

The crucial test of a theory is "... that it not only solves the problem which led to its formulation, but is found to shed light on other problems which were not under consideration at the time" (p. 14).

The author arrives at the conclusion that the liturgical theory stands the test gloriously. It not only explains some points of the system of Gospel lections in the Greek Church, as well as in the Roman Missal and Anglican Prayer Book, but it also throws light on certain statements of John the Elder (or on points of the controversy based on these statements). Some practices and ideas of Docetism and early Alexandrian Gnosticism appear in a new light, and the Gospel units of the school of form criticism are provided with their natural setting.

This summary shows clearly that a detailed and thorough discussion of the author's theory and arguments would result in another book. I must confine myself, therefore, to some remarks concerning the main points.

As for the chapter-enumeration in the old manuscripts—are these numbers really related to the liturgical use; in other words, are these manuscripts really lectionaries? The Eusebian canons, which the author dismisses as “quite another matter” (p. 23), prove, nevertheless, that at the time these manuscripts were copied, the need was felt for a means of reference and comparison prior to the present division into chapters and verses. Could the chapter systems not have been introduced for such an aim as this? I admit this is only a supposition, but *a priori* not less probable. Suppose, for the sake of argument, that the chapter numbers in the manuscripts were indeed related to the liturgical use, the question still stands: do they belong to a continual lection system; in other words, does the sequence of the numbers correspond with the sequence of the lections, or was, for instance, the Gospel divided into a series of numbered sections to facilitate the turning-up of the lection for a certain day, e.g.: for Sunday “A”, lection 12 of Mark; for Sunday “B”, lection 25 of Matthew, etc.?

A continual Marcan system would have its origin, as the author says himself, “. . . in the period when each church made use of a single gospel for its liturgical purposes, and this may be considered to have closed in the first quarter of the second century” (p. xiii). The consequent conclusion is that the chapter-enumeration would still have been copied for two centuries after it had lost its practical purpose. This needs at least some proof. I do not believe that the Matthaean non-*B* system and the 55-chapter system of the *Diatessaron* are of much help in bridging this gap, since the Matthaean non-*B* system is known only from manuscripts younger than *B*; and as for the *Diatessaron*, reference is made to an eleventh-century Arabic translation from the Syriac.¹ What guarantee have we that we are here in touch with the

¹ A manuscript of a Latin form of the *Diatessaron*, divided into 182 sections, was discovered by Victor, Bishop of Capua, between A.D. 541 and 554. The manuscript itself cannot be much older, for the Vulgate text has been substituted for the original “Old Latin” (cf. p. 102).

original or at least centuries-old Matthaean and *Diatessaron* system? Is it the correspondence between Matthew non-*B* and Mark *B*? An examination¹ leads me to the conclusion that the closer correspondence is not between Mark *B* and Matthew non-*B*, but between Matthew *B* and Mark *B* on the one hand and Matthew non-*B* and Mark non-*B* on the other. A closer study of the corresponding as well as of the non-corresponding sections would be necessary to justify the conclusion that the division in Matthew was based on the division in Mark. In my opinion, it is at least possible that the correspondence is due to the fact of the division having been based on the sections suggested by the Gospels themselves.

Some questions remain concerning the Marcan Gospel. Does either of the chapter divisions (the *B* or non-*B* system) correspond to the structure of the Gospel so naturally that it can be said to be approximately the original plan of the Gospel? The statement "It almost looks as if the gospel were so planned as to make this secondary arrangement (the non-*B* system) a possibility" (pp. 36 f.) seems to me a dangerous one since it is two-edged. The Gospel may be planned for both arrangements as well as for neither of them, but each could be based on a different appreciation of the natural points of division in the Gospel, and indeed I am unable to say that the chapters of either of these two systems correspond, even approximately, so closely to the natural sections of the Gospel as to force one, more or less, to the conclusion that this is almost the original plan. The divisions of the synopses and commentaries show other possibilities, some of which appear equally feasible.

The second question directly concerns the theory: Is the relation between the chapter division in *B* and the liturgical calendar so close that the inevitable conclusion is that the Gospel has been made for liturgical purposes as a lectionary? The main division into 48(49)

¹ I compared the *B* and non-*B* systems of Matthew and Mark (I was not able to compare the system of the Arabic translation of the *Diatessaron*, but the Latin MS (cf. preceding note) proves at least that another system existed five centuries before the Arabic translation originated); and to avoid subjectivism as far as possible, I took as a basis of comparison the parallels between Matthew and Mark as indicated in the *Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien* by Huck-Lietzmann (9th edn., Tübingen 1936). As for Matthew *B* and Mark *B* there are 40 cases of coincidence of one section of Matthew or Mark with one or more sections of the other. Only in three of these cases is the sequence of the sections not in the same order in Matthew and Mark. So the division of Matthew and Mark coincides in *B* 37 times in the same order, and these 37 cases affect 40 out of the 62 sections of Mark. Between Matthew non-*B* and Mark non-*B* the cases of coincidence are as follows: 29 cases; twice the corresponding sections are not in the same order in Matthew and Mark, the other 27 cases affect 32 out of the 48(49) sections of Mark non-*B*. Between Matthew non-*B* and Mark *B* the coincidence is: 17 cases; once the corresponding sections are not in the same order in Matthew and Mark, the other 16 cases affect 22 out of the 62 sections of Mark *B*. Matthew *B* and Mark non-*B*: 27 cases of coincidence, once the corresponding sections are not in the same order in Matthew and Mark; the other 26 cases affect 27 out of the 48(49) sections of Mark non-*B*.

lections for the liturgical year and 14 lections for the Passover does not seem to me to be convincing, because of the starting-point of the Pascha-lection. I am unable to convince myself that it was the intention of St Mark to start his Passion narrative at XIII.1 and so include the Discourse on the Mount of Olives. In my opinion XIV.1 f. retains the stronger claim to being the introduction to the Passion in the mind of the author. Moreover, if the Passion narrative was intended as one lection—and the author says on page 206: "It (the Passion narrative) was intended to be read as a whole and not cut up into smaller lections"—no proper reason has been given for its division into 14 sections.

Another difficulty concerns the lections for the Feast of Tabernacles. The statement "We are bound, now, to suggest that it *was* the season of figs, and that these eight words (XI.13) are a gloss" (p. 27) does nothing to strengthen the theory; on the contrary.

"The pivot on which our theory has turned has been the equation of the Feeding of the Five Thousand with the Sunday after the Pascha and the Feeding of the Four Thousand with Pentecost fifty days later," says the author on page 134. By adopting the Hebrew calendar, however, the primitive Church did not necessarily cling to the pure Hebrew character of the feasts of that calendar, especially for those feasts to which were attached reminiscences of the great historical events of the redemption and origin of the Church. Thus Easter Sunday was no longer the Feast of the First Sheaf but the Feast of the Resurrection, the completion of the Passion as the crown on the victory; and in the same way Pentecost was no longer the Feast of the Loaves of New Wheat, but rather connected with Easter as the consequent fruit: viz. the fructification of the infant Church with the Holy Spirit of Christ. The Feeding of the Five Thousand and the Feeding of the Four Thousand fit in ill with the proper character of these feasts. One would expect rather on Easter Sunday a Resurrection-lection as the crowning of the Passion narrative, e.g. Mk. XVI.1-8, and on Pentecost a lection concerning the working of the Holy Ghost or the role of the Apostles in the Church, e.g. Mk. III.13-19 or VI.6-13. The part of the Gospel between the Feeding of the Five Thousand and the Feeding of the Four Thousand has been divided into six lections indeed, but I doubt whether this division can claim originality. It seems to me that the division into five sections of the Synopsis of Huck-Lietzmann (*op. cit.* pp. 89 ff., no. 115), taking together lections 28 and 29 (Mk. VII.1-16 and VII.17-23; cf. Mark non-B, lection 8), is better suited to the natural structure of the Gospel.

The negative character of this review of the author's theory does not affect in the least, however, my high estimation of the many

THE ORIGIN OF ST MARK'S GOSPEL

interesting indications and suggestions which he has brought forward, and which certainly deserve due attention. It is for this reason that, in spite of the doubt which I thought it my duty to express with regard to the conclusiveness of the arguments alleged in proof of the liturgical theory, I look forward with keen interest to the second volume of this work, the commentary on St Mark's Gospel, in which the author promises "... to relate the calendrical order of the gospel to its general background in thought and history, and to establish its significance in relation to the Christian movement" (p. xiv).

ANT. J. VAN DER VOORT, S.C.J.

*Saint Joseph's College,
Malpas, Cheshire*

PROPHECY IN ISRAEL

It is due to the prophets that belief in the true God and worship of Him were kept alive in the world, before the coming of Jesus Christ. As the mouthpiece of God they spoke out : (a) for the general guidance of the people, (b) to condemn evil living, (c) to give consolation in distress. Ricciotti, in his *History of Israel*, describes the prophet as the spring which kept the oasis of true religion fertile in the desert of paganism. It is commonly thought that prophets arose only in moments of emergency, and that when all was well they were absent. The remarkable absence of a prophet during the three centuries or so before Christ certainly seems to lend colour to this view. For the people then were certainly on the whole faithful to God—far more so than before. But the explanation does not fit the much longer period preceding and during the exile.

Deut. XVIII.15 f. announces that prophecy will be a regular feature in the life of Israel ; a living and constant sign of God's interest in His people—and their history seems to bear this out. There is a constant line—at least down to Malachias. Israel was on the whole flattered by their presence, concerned at their absence after Malachias and correspondingly delighted when the Baptist appeared.

The prophet, then, spoke *on behalf of God*. We often think of him as one who foretells, but this was only one of his many duties. The prophet had to communicate God's words to men.

The prophet therefore was essentially a man who was in communication with God in a special way—a way that was not shared by others. However much they differed in character and however much their functions developed and altered this is always true.

But it is true that over a period of a thousand years or so they did differ considerably, and it is possible to detect a broad division into two types. There is a text in 1 Kings IX.9, which runs as follows : "He that is now called a *prophet*, in time past was called a *seer*". The words used are *nabhi* and *ro'eh*. Notice that he does not say "There used to be seers, but *now* we have prophets", as though they had no connexion. His words imply something common and also something different—for a change of name implies some change of character—and the evidence bears this out.

What were the earliest prophets—or rather seers—like ? Moses of course is the first great example. But at the same time not typical of the early period. He is more like the later prophets and at the same time towering above them. He was on terms of intimacy with God

and he occupied a position of such prominence in Israel, as God's mouthpiece, that there was no equal to him found in later times. One has only to scan the five books of Moses to see this. The sacred writer does not exaggerate when he says: "And there arose no more a prophet in Israel like unto Moses whom the Lord knew face to face" (Deut. xxxiv.10). So also Joshua. The mantle of Moses fell as it were on him, and the Lord spoke through him to Israel much as He had done through Moses. And like Moses, he exhorted the people before his death, renewing the covenant again which had been struck by Moses.

It is during the period of *Judges* that we find examples of the type of *seer* that was evidently common in Israel at that time, e.g. Deborah (Jg. iv). The Bible calls her a prophetess but her functions are those of the typical *seer*. "She judged the people", i.e. solved cases of all kinds, besides formal lawsuits. Evidently she held a position of some importance, and if necessary could assume the function of leader of her people. She did this in the crisis that arose when the Canaanites in the North were oppressing Israel. Though Barac was the general, Deborah was the real leader, for she summoned Barac to the work; and it is Deborah who is chiefly extolled in the canticle in ch.v. She describes herself as "Mother in Israel" (v.7). This is all the more extraordinary when one considers the minor position usually occupied by women in Semitic peoples. The narrative however does not tell us a great deal about her functions. There is also a surprising dearth of information in the rest of the *Book of Judges*. It is only when we get to the *Books of Samuel* (1 and 2 Kings) that we are further enlightened.

1 Sam. ix presents Samuel to us as the typical *seer*. Saul and his servant, wishing to consult him, meet him on his way to sacrifice in a high place. He holds an honourable position in the town and is able to offer strangers a share in the sacrifice. He has been in communication with Yahweh the day before, and is able to tell them the animals lost by Saul's father have been recovered; and he hints at Saul's high destiny too. After the sacrifice Samuel invites Saul and his servant to his own home. Next morning he accompanies them out of town (Ramah) and then anoints Saul (x.1). Finally he predicts three signs to be fulfilled before Saul reaches home. These are fulfilled. Note here (1) *The seer* is the man of God. (He communicates with Yahweh.) He can apparently control his communication, for people expect to go to him with questions for which he can get answers at will. Apparently also a fee was required (ix. 7-8). (2) His chief function is to describe events (past, present and future) hidden from ordinary men. Usually it seems they are personal and even trivial matters, but sometimes of

national importance. (3) He clearly has a position of importance and honour. Note the details of the sacrifice, and note also that the whole company wait for their food till he has pronounced blessing on it. The whole picture is one of a sober, dignified, weighty person, standing high in favour with God, and in honour with men.

During the period of *Judges* then, prophets were not of the outstanding type of the preceding period—Moses—nor of the later period. This may have been because Israel was not very faithful to God during that period. 1 Sam. iii.1 seems to suggest this as a reason, but not explicitly. In other words, God possibly withheld his communications as a sort of punishment. But He did not continuously act like this, for at later periods when Israel was equally unfaithful (e.g. 600 B.C.) God sent prophets—e.g. Jeremias; while, once more, after 300 B.C., when they seem to have been quite faithful, there was no prophet for about three centuries.

The type of prophet with whom we are more familiar begins to appear—or reappear—at the time of Samuel. In fact Samuel himself seems to embody in himself the qualities of both seer and prophet. As Ricciotti has observed, there appears to be some connexion with the change in social conditions. *As the unity of the people began to re-assert itself, so did the familiar figure of the prophet emerge.* Under Moses and Joshua they had been one people. They were split up in the time of the Judges. They united again under Samuel. The emergence of the typical prophet can hardly fail to have some connexion with social conditions. He had a more official character. He spoke to the nation in place of God. (This was practically impossible in the time of *Judges*.) Whereas in "*Judges*", the seer was merely *there to be consulted, now the prophet gave God's orders when God wished, and did not wait to be asked.* Again, the seer usually confined himself to a particular case (e.g. Saul's asses)—but the prophet proclaimed aloud the basic principles of morality and religion. He was God's mouthpiece and ambassador to the nation. Thus Jeremias said, "For I am speaking now this long time, crying out against iniquity, and I often proclaim devastation" (Jer. xx.8). There were many things of national importance he had to speak about—e.g. immorality and idolatry, and the dangers of foreign alliances. Elias is the typical prophet. Though of course each prophet differed in many ways from every other, yet there are certain great features in common. They are all utterly devoted to the cause of God and are fully prepared to suffer death for Him. They all say the same thing: "Yahweh has spoken". That is enough—come what may. "If the Lord speaks, who will not prophesy?" asks Amos (iii.8). The call of God was decisive. Some, like Jeremias, accepted reluctantly, but they accepted

(Jer. xiv). Indeed there seems to have been something compulsory in the call to prophesy (e.g. Ezech. iii.1-4).

The prophet was a man of God not only because he spoke for God, but also *because he led a life of heroic sanctity*. Here at least there was freedom of choice. They did devote themselves whole-heartedly to God's service; and that meant to expose themselves to danger—sometimes imminent danger of death. No doubt the people recognised the prophet as from God, but his stern denunciations of their sins, though often bringing them to repentance, equally often exasperated them to the point of persecuting him and putting him to death. See for example the way Ahab and Jezebel persecuted Elias; or the tradition which relates that Isaias was sawn in half by Manasses. No doubt these acts were done by kings. But the people were just as bad. Very often the prophets' work of recalling to God met with little response and even hostility. "Behold", says God to Jeremias, "I have made thee this day a fortified city and a pillar of iron, and a wall of brass over all the land to the Kings of Juda, to the princes thereof, and to the priests and to the people of the land" (Jer. i.18). "And they shall fight against thee, and shall not prevail, for I am with thee, saith the Lord".

The prophet always had this prospect before his eyes when called by God. And often the worst happened. He never yielded an inch, never watered down the commands of God, never curried favour with the great and powerful as he might so easily have done—and as the false prophets nearly always did, e.g. Jer. viii.11, xiv.15. The attitude of the people was what one would expect of worldly and superficial men. It fluctuated between reverence and persecution, between confidence and complete lack of understanding. Unfortunately in their moments of exasperation the people frequently killed the prophets. Then—smitten with compunction—they raised monuments to their memory (Mt. xxiii.29).

R. C. FULLER

THE DIVINE NAME OF YAHWEH

The divine name of Yahweh is recorded as having been revealed to Moses in Ex. III.14-15 : "And God said to Moses, I am the God who IS ; thou shalt tell the Israelites, THE GOD WHO IS has sent me to you. And he charged Moses again, That is what thou shalt tell the sons of Israel, that the God of their fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob has sent thee to them, and this is the name he will be known by for ever ; it shall stand recorded, age after age".¹ In the East a man acquired power over a being if he knew its name. That the name expressed in some way the nature of a being is clear from the names given to children in the Pentateuch.² The name by which God chose to answer Moses' question could not have been a merely arbitrary one for the sake of distinguishing Him from other gods ; it had to give expression to the hopes of Israel, and so the prophet Micheas says : "Let other nations go their own way, each with the name of its own God to rally it ; ours to march under the banner of Yahweh, our God for ever and for evermore" (iv.5, Knox's translation, except the spelling of the divine name). Since only the Divinity Itself could make Its name known, Moses sought the name of God as a credential for the people of Israel. Yahweh, the name that God selects, seems already to have been in use. Various indications are found in the composition of place-names and the names of men, and there is an apparent, though disputed, reference to a god Yaw at Ras Shamra. An entirely new name might have detached some of the Israelites from the God of their forefathers, whereas a name with which some of them were already familiar would perhaps have been more easily accepted. There was nothing to prevent this name from acquiring a new wealth of meaning in the course of time. Hitherto God had been referred to as the Most High, the Eternal, the Omnipotent, and by His dealings with men—the Strength of Jacob, the God of my father.

¹ Knox's translation. The Vulgate version is : "Dixit Deus ad Moysen : Ego sum qui sum. Ait : Sic dices filiis Israel : Qui est, misit me ad vos. Dixitque iterum Deus ad Moysen : Haec dices filiis Israel : Dominus Deus patrum vestrorum, Deus Abraham, Deus Isaac, et Deus Jacob, misit me ad vos ; hoc nomen mihi est in aeternum ; et hoc memoriale meum in generationem et generationem".

² The names defined in this way are those of Cain (Gen. iv.1), Seth (iv.25), Noe (v.29), Isaac (xxi.6), Reuben and the other sons of Jacob (xxix.31-xxx.24), Phares (xxxviii.29), Manasse and Ephraim (xli.51-2), Moses (Ex. ii.10), Gersam (ii.22), Eliezer (xviii.4). One may also include the new name given to Abram (Gen. xvii.5), the allusions to the names of Ismael (xxi.17) and Jacob (xxv.25), and the explanation of the names of Phaleg (x.25) and of Babel (xi.9).

Tradition has usually¹ seen in this text a reference to the idea of being or existence, and has generally linked it with our Lord's claim: "Before Abraham came to be, I am" (Westminster Version, Jn. viii.58). In recent years, however, a view² has been advanced that radically reinterprets the significance of this passage. It has, of course, always been agreed that the name could not have had the same wealth of meaning for the Hebrews as it has come to possess for us. For them being was not a statically conceived perfection, but rather something dynamic. God, in the context, is describing Himself as an agency ready to help when He is invoked (iii.12—"I will be with thee"). The Septuagint has encouraged a metaphysical interpretation by translating the declaration in iii.14 as "ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν" ("I am Being"), which influenced the "Ego sum qui sum" of the Latin versions. The Fathers, the theologians of the Middle Ages, and modern exegetes have developed this text as a statement that God is the infinite Being, the Being existing necessarily of Himself. Yet if God had wanted to say, "I am Being", one would have expected a different construction. In Hebrew the verb "to be" is very rarely used as a copula; thus one would not say, "I am the man who slew the lion", but, "I—man that slew the lion".³ The former construction is of the pattern: "I am going where I go", or, "I show mercy where I show mercy".

It is now argued that the name by which God designates Himself must be read in the determined sense of what has gone before, as is the case with those other names defined in the Pentateuch.⁴ The first reply "I am who I am" lays the foundations for the names Ehyeh and Yahweh: God speaks of Himself in the first person (Ehyeh—I am), whilst men speak of Him in the third (Yahweh—he is). The translation now proposed is: "And God said to Moses: 'I am who I am'. And he said: 'Thou shalt say thus to the children of Israel: Ehyeh sends me to you'. And God spoke again to Moses: 'Thou shalt say thus to the children of Israel: Yahweh, the God of your fathers, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob sends me to you. This is my name for ever, it is my memorial from generation to generation'". In assessing God's first reply, "I am who I am", one must remember that in popular usage this name would not be expected to exhaust the

¹ So the new *Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*, 165a. For a defence of the traditional view, see Ceuppens, "Theologia Biblica, De De Uno". The text of Isaiah xlii.8 with its inference (my name . . . my glory) has to be reckoned with.

² This article is little more than a summary of Père Dubarle's article in the *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* of January 1951.

³ Instances are: "I am God Almighty" (Gen. xvi.1); "I am Yahweh" (Gen. xv.7, etc.); "I am the God of Abraham" (Gen. xxvi.24, etc.); "I am God, the God of your father" (Gen. xli.3); "I am the God of Bethel" (Gen. xxxi.13); "I am the jealous God" (Ex. xx.5); "I am mercy" (Ex. xxii.26); etc.

⁴ See Note 2 on previous page.

meaning of the person designated. On the other hand, the solemnity of the occasion demanded more than an empty title.

The original sense of the expression, "I am who I am", necessary for a right understanding of the name Yahweh, must be looked for in parallel texts in the Bible. These are found to be of two kinds : (a) replies of a supernatural being to questions about its name ; and (b) analogous constructions.

(a) In Gen. xxxii.29 and Jg. xiii.18 there are the evasive replies of the angel to Jacob and to Manue respectively. The implication of these replies is that the supernatural being does not easily reveal himself, and always safeguards his mysteriousness and independence. On Sinai (Ex. xxxiii.18-23) God will only reveal Himself on His own initiative, and Moses is only permitted the merest glimpse of His being ; and He "shews favour where he will" (lit. He gives the favour to whom He gives the favour).

(b) The same construction is found in expressions where the verb of the principal clause receives a complement, direct or circumstantial, in the form of a relative clause. This subordinate clause simply repeats the main verb, or else gives a substantive followed by some relative clause (e.g. "He teaches what he teaches", and, "He counts the hours that he counts"). The subject remains the same ; the tense may change. The construction is common to many Semitic languages (notably Arabic and Aramaic) and often does the work of an indefinite pronoun. It is primarily indeterminate in effect, and is especially useful when the writer wishes to generalise.¹

The conclusion advanced is that in Ex. iii.14 the Hebrew certainly expresses indetermination. When man has, on other occasions, asked a similar question, he has received either blank refusal or he has been given an answer with sufficient safeguard for the divine transcendence. The phrase "I am who I am" is a deliberate enigmatic reply, and is best translated literally. God does not wish to define Himself, and His consequent adoption of names, Ehyeh or Yahweh, must be understood in the light of this prefatory declaration. The name is not intended as a definition of the nature of God, nor even of what is most fundamental to His nature. It cannot be made the basis or resumé of all that man can know of God ; rather does it remind the creature of his utter powerlessness to penetrate that Mystery. Israel must be content with the assurance that God is the God who will deliver them from servitude. Furthermore, by this name God allows a certain

¹ Instances are : "They went where they went" (i Kings xxiii.13) ; "I will go where I will go" (ii Kings xv.20) ; "Dwell where you would dwell" (iv Kings viii.1) ; "Send whom thou wilt send" (Ex. iv.13) ; and similarly : Ex. xvi.23, Deut. xxxix.15, Ezech. xii.25 and xxxvi.20, Gen. xliii.14, Esth. iv.16.

familiarity with His chosen people, but He does not surrender Himself. Actually it is the expression "Yahweh, the God who brought you out of Egypt", or its equivalent, that is found everywhere in the Bible as the characteristic of their God.

These verses, far from presenting a determined notion as particularly apt to express what we can know of God, and far from giving us any definition, show us God revealing Himself in a given historical situation, and introducing the name of Yahweh to indicate the impossibility of defining God. This idea of indefinability, of the ineffable, must not be transformed into a negative definition, or become the source of all other declarations about God ; but it is not intended to call a halt to our speculations. The intention is to remind us of the unbridgeable gulf which divides our idea of God from the reality which it strives to express. We can and should speak of God, but always with the realisation of the inadequacy of what we say. Consciousness of our limitations should accompany our praise of Him : "Can any praise be worthy of the Lord's majesty, any thought set limits to his greatness?" says the Psalmist (CXLIV.3) in a song that exalts God for those very attributes that are presupposed in the passage we have been considering : power, goodness and justice.

When Ben Sirach has proclaimed (Ecclesiasticus XLIII.29-35) the work of the Creator in the visible universe, and is about to hymn His solicitude for Israel from the beginning, he stops for a moment to admit man's inability to praise worthily a God Who surpasses all human speech. A better commentary on the verses in *Exodus* can hardly be attempted :

When we have said everything that we can,
the end of the matter is that He is All.
Let us praise Him then because we cannot reach Him,
for is He not greater than all His works ?
The Lord is terrible and exceeding great,
and marvellous is His power.
Raise your voices, you who praise the Lord,
to their full power ; He is always there to be praised.
You who exalt Him, search yet for new phrases,
and be not discouraged for you will still not reach Him.
Who is there who has seen Him and can speak of it,
and who shall praise Him as He is ?¹

¹ A translation of Père Dubarle's rendering.

CHARLES R. A. CUNLIFFE

CATHOLIC ENGLISH BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THE PSALMS

INTRODUCTORY

This bibliography is designed to supplement the one compiled by Fr E. F. Sutcliffe, S.J., and published in *Scripture*, 1 (1946), 91-3. It comprises works published since 1946 and other material, chiefly articles in periodicals, not included in the previous list.

I. TRANSLATIONS, PARAPHRASES AND COMMENTARIES

(a) General

- Mgr T. E. BIRD, "The Psalms", in *Cath. Comm.*, sects. 334-63.
 R. J. FOSTER, *Psalms and Canticles of the Breviary*. Mercier Press 1947. 15s.
 Mgr E. J. KISSANE, *The Book of Psalms: translated from a critically revised Hebrew text, with a Commentary*. VOL. I (Pss. 1-72). Browne and Nolan 1953. 30s.
 Mgr R. A. KNOX, *The Book of Psalms in Latin and English, with the Canticles used in the Divine Office (the new Latin Version of the Pontifical Biblical Institute, with an English translation)*. B.O.W. 1947, and reprints. In various bindings, from 6s.

(b) Individual Psalms

- Mgr P. P. SAYDON, "The Divine Sonship in Ps. 2", in *Scripture*, III (1948), 32-4.
 R. C. FULLER, "The Meaning of Ps. II, verse 3", in *Scripture*, IV (1950), 249-50.
 T. WORDEN, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" in *Scripture*, VI (1953), 9-16.
 Mgr E. J. KISSANE, "Foderunt manus meas et pedes meos", in *Irish Theological Quarterly*, XIX (1952), 72-4.
 Dom R. RIOS, O.S.B., "Thirst for God (Psalms 41 and 42)", in *Scripture*, II (1947), 34-7.
 E. F. SUTCLIFFE, S.J., "The Labour and Sorrow of Life (a note on Ps. 89, 10)", in *Scripture*, V (1952), 97.
 Dom R. RIOS, O.S.B., "A Call to Worship (Ps. 94)", in *Scripture*, I (1946), 74-6.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON THE PSALMS

- Mgr E. J. KISSANE, "The interpretation of Ps. 108", in *Irish Theological Quarterly*, xviii (1951), 1-8.
 L. D. MURPHY, S.J., "Messiah, the Priest-King (Ps. 109)", in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, xxi (1923), 174-80.
 J. HENNIG, "Ps. 116 in the Liturgy", in *Irish Theological Quarterly*, xix (1952), 192-5.
 J. H. DARBY, "In praise of the Law : Ps. 118", in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, lxxiv (1950), 426-32.

3. THE NEW LATIN PSALTER

- Mgr J. M. T. BARTON, "The New Latin Psalter and its Translations", in *Clergy Review*, xxx (1948), 11-22.
 Mgr P. BOYLAN, "New Official Latin Version of the Breviary Psalter", in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, lxvi (1945), 73-80.
 C. LATTEY, S.J., "The New Latin Psalter", in *Scripture* (1st series), October 1945, 8-10.
 E. C. MESSENGER, "The New Psalter : some notes and queries", in *Clergy Review*, xxvii (1947), 174-8.
 F. J. PINKMAN, "The New Latin Psalter", in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, lxx (1948), 193-205.
 W. REES, "The New Latin Psalter", in *Scripture*, iv (1950), 205-11.
 C. L. SMITH, "Psallere cum intelligentia", in *Clergy Review*, xxvi (1946), 9-15.
 A. WATKIN, O.S.B., "A Note on Father Pinkman's article on the New Psalter", in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, lxx (1948), 524-30.

4. MISCELLANEOUS

- J. H. DARBY, (i) "Jewish Psalm and Christian Prayer", in *Clergy Review*, xxxv (1951), 25-33 ; (ii) "Psallite sapienter", in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, lxxviii (1952), 179-86.
 G. DONLEAVY, *Sonnets on the Psalms*. B.O.W. 1939. 5s.
 Dom R. RIOS, O.S.B., "The Enduring Actuality of the Psalter", in *Scripture* (1st series), January 1945, 2-4.

G. GRAYSTONE, S.M.

Mount St Mary's,
 Milltown, Dublin

BOOK REVIEWS

La Sainte Bible, TOM.I, PT.I : *Genesis*, translation and commentary by Canon A. Clamer. Paris 1953. Pp. 530.

This series of commentaries on the whole Bible is already well known, and Canon Clamer has already published commentaries on the three later books of the Pentateuch. This volume, to be completed by a commentary on *Exodus*, begins with an important introduction to the Pentateuch in which the author considers the complex questions of sources and Mosaic authorship. This introduction is particularly useful because the many difficulties which a study of the Pentateuch entails are not generally appreciated ; here they are clearly and quite fully explained. Too many Catholics are still amazingly complacent : they dismiss the documentary hypotheses as fantasies devised by misguided or malevolent "Higher Critics". This attitude arises largely from ignorance of the difficulties for whose solution the theories of different sources have been evolved. There is also a certain anxiety, when approaching these theories, which arises from our concern for the Mosaic authorship. Those who know little about these questions could scarcely wish for a better introduction to the subject than this introduction. Clamer explains how abrupt changes of style, different accounts of the same event, linguistic peculiarities and anachronisms all make it impossible to consider the Pentateuch in its present form as the work of a single author. He points out how inadequate it is to dismiss such features on the ground of coincidence, the oriental love of repetition, conscious variation of style, or the changes of style which naturally arise from the variety of subjects treated. Some such explanations may be satisfactory for any single case, but possible explanations prove insufficient as we meet with more and more difficulties of the same kind. We are therefore forced to investigate the sources from which the Pentateuch was compiled. Clamer reviews the efforts of scholars to decide this question, from the beginnings of source-criticism to the latest theories of the Uppsala school, with its insistence on oral traditions rather than written sources. The variety of solutions offered serves to show the complexity of the problem and warns us against a too-ready acceptance of any particular solution. It does not, however, prove that the difficulties do not exist, nor that it is misguided to seek solution through source-criticism, and Clamer reviews the efforts which Catholic scholars have made, ending with a detailed account of the view expressed by De Vaux in *La Bible de*

Jérusalem. The author also considers the question of the Mosaic authorship and the decree of the Pontifical Biblical Commission on that question. Then he passes to a delicate subject: the historical character of the Pentateuch. Here too, the principles are clarified with good examples. He warns us that we must not impose our rigid conditions for the writing of history upon the sacred authors, who never for one moment considered themselves bound by any such rules. On the other hand, an "unhistorical" style does not exclude the possibility of truly historical facts. Whilst the Pentateuch is not a history in the modern sense, it contains many historical facts; to deny, for instance, a firm historical foundation for the pre-Mosaic stories is a wanton exaggeration, whilst the fact that the Israelites worshipped Yahweh throughout their history cannot be adequately explained without an historical Moses who brought them out of the land of Egypt. In the final section on the religious value of the Pentateuch, Clamer insists on the unity which exists between the Testaments, and describes the role which Adam, Noe and Abraham, Isaac and Jacob play in the writings of the New Testament and the Fathers.

A good commentary on *Genesis* is particularly necessary for Catholics who are often distressed at the apparent contradictions between the Bible and the natural sciences. It is especially important that they should understand the true character of the stories in the first three chapters dealing with the creation and the Fall. In the commentary on these chapters the reader will find all the important questions treated fully and clearly, by generous reference to all the modern works. Clamer reviews the various attempts to reconcile the literal interpretation of the text with the scientific discoveries, before it was realised that the sacred author had no intention of giving a scientific explanation of how the world was created. He considers the evolutionary theory in relation to man and the teaching of *Humani generis* on polygenism. Regarding the story of the Fall, Clamer writes at length on the fuller sense of the *protoevangelium* (III.15) in relation to patristic teaching and the papal definitions of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption. When considering the nature of the offence committed, or more precisely the external act by which the pride of our first parents was made manifest, the author pays particular attention to the view, lately revived by Coppens, that it was a sexual transgression, but quotes also De Vaux's criticism. The inclusion of several Babylonian parallels to these stories will be useful to many to whom these texts are not otherwise available. There can hardly be a better commentary from which we can quickly ascertain the latest opinions of the exegetes, whilst at the same time feel assured that these opinions are judged in the light of the Church's teaching. This is true of the

whole commentary : such questions as the ages of the Patriarchs, the story of Melchisedek, the names of the twelve sons of Jacob, are all treated in relation to the particular purpose which the author had in mind ; but Clamer also shows by frequent quotation from the Fathers how such stories were used in the later developments of religious teaching. Those who are already familiar with the most modern commentaries on *Genesis* may regret that the author has allowed himself so little space for his own opinions and conclusions. But they must remember that he has rendered a greater service by making the latest scholarly work on *Genesis* available for those who wish to rely on a safe guide : one who will give due consideration to the many difficulties which *Genesis* contains ; one who will not seek to explain the texts whilst turning a blind eye to the knowledge we now have through the progress made in other sciences, and yet someone who is always conscious of the fact that the Church is the custodian of revealed truth.

T. WORDEN

La Sainte Bible, Editions du Cerf, Paris 1953. *Esdras and Nehemias*, ed. and tr. A. Gelin, P.S.S.

It is probably true to say that the restoration after the exile is the period in Old Testament history about which most of us know least. Yet it saw the birth of Judaism and the beginning of a political and religious situation which was to continue, in essentials, into the New Testament period. Our ignorance is due in large measure to the obscurities in the sources at our disposal. It is commonly admitted that the problems connected with *Esdras-Nehemias* are among the most formidable which face the scholar. Hence in the introduction to this new translation there is a detailed consideration of the questions of chronology and sources, which affect the understanding of this period so much. There is ample evidence that we cannot read these books as though their different parts were arranged in chronological sequence. Many have attempted to recover the true sequence of events, and it has long been the hypothesis of many scholars that *Nehemias* preceded *Esdras*. In this case the Artaxerxes mentioned in *Esdr.* vii.8 must be the second of that name (404-358 B.C.). Yet, as Gelin remarks, there is no indication whatsoever that the author intends to refer to two different kings of the same name. He therefore seeks a solution which, whilst accepting the hypothesis that *Nehemias* preceded *Esdras*, avoids the supposition of two Artaxerxes, and he suggests that *Esdras* came to Jerusalem after the first, but before the second mission of

Nehemias. This demands a correction of the year from seventh to thirty-seventh in Esdr. vii.8, and the chronological sequence will be : 445-433 B.C., first mission of Nehemias ; 427-426 B.C., mission of Esdras ; before 424 B.C. (i.e. before the death of Artaxerxes I), second mission of Nehemias. But if this be the true sequence, why has the author deranged his sources so confusingly ? Gelin suggests that the present arrangement is due to the author's desire to deal with the two aspects of this period separately : the return and the reconstruction of the Temple, and the organisation of the community. Further, he wished to represent Nehemias and Esdras as contemporaries (cf. Neh. viii.9 ; xii.26, 36), and the latter as a priest would take precedence over Nehemias the layman. Gelin recognises that this, like all other attempted solutions, contains hypothetical elements, but it is certainly a solution which has much to recommend it. The introduction to this translation therefore, limited as it must be, consists largely in the discussion of a problem which will interest and possibly only be appreciated by the specialist. It is more technical than most of the introductions in this series ; but the opening pages on the restoration are of great value to the general reader, while the paragraphs on the religious significance of the book will help him to realise, perhaps for the first time, how this period of reconstruction laid that solid foundation which enabled Judaism to survive the fierce onslaughts of Hellenism. It is with a feeling of pride not unmingled with envy that English Catholics watch the rapid completion of this magnificent project : *La Bible de Jérusalem*. This contribution fully maintains the high standard of scholarship we have come to expect from any work which bears on its title page the words : *sous la direction de l'École Biblique de Jérusalem*.

T. WORDEN

Abbé J. Steinmann, *Lectures de Judith*, Gabalda, Paris 1953. Pp. 137. 300 fr.

Anyone who has attempted to solve the numerous historical and topographical difficulties of the *Book of Judith* will open this book with a certain anxiety in case it should be yet another desperate effort to maintain the historicity. Those who have not laboured through such efforts will be robbed of that feeling of relief which comes from reading the first few pages. It is obvious that the approach is going to be a much saner one, as indeed anyone who is acquainted with Father Steinmann's books would expect. It is in the manner of *approach* to the problem—something difficult to define and yet so important—that

the value of this book lies. The author is by no means the first Catholic scholar to maintain that the historical details cannot be accepted at their face-value, and therefore must be understood symbolically. It is commonly held, for instance, that Nabuchodonosor is not Nabuchodonosor but Artaxerxes III Ochus; that Ninive is not Ninive and the period is post- not pre-exilic; that Arphaxad is not a Median king, and so on. Having proved convincingly the sacred author's "superb indifference to profane history", Steinmann does not try to force the story into an historical setting. It is an apocalypse, characterised not so much by the usual "apocalyptic dialect", but rather by the fantastic use of names and situations culled from the history books and the Scriptures. The shifting topography is yet another indication of its apocalyptic flavour. Why worry if Bethulia moves rather disconcertingly from the Plain of Esdraelon to within easy reach of Jerusalem? Bethulia and its inhabitants, Samaritans and hellenised, are saved by the pious Jews, in the guise of a woman whose ancestry mocks at the aristocrats of the time, a widow though young and beautiful, an anchoress clothed in sack-cloth, fasting constantly, diligent in her ablutions. By her hand God triumphs over evil, and Jerusalem is saved from the beast; the Jews rejoice for they have emerged victorious in the hour of trial. Thus the author of the *Book of Judith* has succeeded, by a story partly *haggada* and partly apocalypse, in conveying to us the optimism of the Maccabean age. Father Steinmann does not solve every individual difficulty, for he has not written a detailed commentary. Some may disagree with the consideration he gives to the story of Judith edited by Gaster (a Hebrew manuscript dating possibly from the eleventh century A.D.), though he gives good reasons for linking the two together. Nevertheless this book can hardly be too highly recommended both to those who want a coherent and consistent interpretation of the *Book of Judith*, and to those who would like to know more about that mysterious Jewish literature which we class as Apocalypse.

T. WORDEN

Dom J. Dupont, O.S.B., *Les Problèmes du Livre des Actes d'après les Travaux Récents* (*Analecta Lovaniensia* II, 17), E. Nauwelaerts, Louvain 1950. Pp. 128. 110 fr.belg.

In the ten years from 1940 to 1950 Dom Dupont has found more than two hundred studies devoted wholly or principally to the *Acts of the Apostles*, the majority of them in German or English, and these he has set out to digest into a form that will commend itself to the non-

professional student of the Scriptures. It is a very useful service that he has thus performed, even though since the appearance of his book three full-length commentaries on Acts have appeared, from Mr Bruce of Sheffield, from Dr Wikenhauser in Germany, and lastly the edition of *Actes* in the *Bible de Jérusalem* produced by Dom Dupont himself in collaboration with L. Cerfaux. One-sixth of his present book is devoted to the central problem of the Council of Jerusalem and its relation to Paul's account in *Galatians* of his visits to Jerusalem, and here an English reader cannot help feeling disappointed with the treatment of Dom Bernard Orchard's skilful attempt to make the best of both Lightfoot and Ramsay (or North Galatian and South Galatian) theories. Dom Dupont dismisses this solution as one which sacrifices the words of St Paul in order to save the historical accuracy of Luke, whereas the whole point of the theory is to explain St Paul's words (Gal. II.4) without having to jettison a single one of them. Dom Dupont has read the first article (*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 1944) where the theory was expounded, but says of the second (*Cath. Bibl. Quarterly* 1945) that he could not find it at Louvain or Paris, while he does not mention the note in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, XLIII (1942), 173-7.

A long section on the theology of *Acts* is largely indebted to the chapter on that subject in W. L. Knox's book on *Acts* (1948) which Dom Dupont follows with little modification. He disagrees with Knox over the interpretation of the first Christian Pentecost, that it was a sending of the Spirit by Christ from heaven parallel (as Knox claims) to the sending of the Law by Moses from the mountain to the people. He denies that there is any early attested linkage of Ps. LXXII.19 (LXX) with the Christian account of Pentecost. He admits that Paul quotes this Psalm in Eph. IV.8 for its reference to the Ascension, but does not think that Peter (in Acts II.33) can be said to echo its words about the gifts which Christ received at His Ascension and gave to men. He has overlooked the use made of the passage by Stephen in Acts VII.38 and also the verbal echo of the Psalm which is found in the D-text of Acts II.33. The general parallel between Christ and Moses, which is certainly urged by Peter (III.22) and Stephen (VII.37) in their speeches, belongs to the very earliest form of Christian preaching and is at the base of the gospel of Matthew. N. Adler has shown (*Das erste christliche Pfingstfest*, Münster 1938, a work not mentioned by Dupont) that the Jewish association of the lawgiving on Sinai with Pentecost is probably later than the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70, and it may well be that it was the Christians who took the first step in this direction, seeing in the Holy Spirit, whom Christ sent them as a gift from on high when He had completed His triumph, a power

greater than the living words of God that were contained in the Old Law.

Among the omissions which one notices, perhaps the most important is the discussion of the name *Christianus* by Erik Peterson in *Miscellanea Mercati* 1 (1946), 355-72, which throws much light on Acts XI.26. The article by Tasker (*Journal of Theological Studies*, XXXVIII, 383-94) on the possible connexion of page 46 with the Caesarian text of *Acts*, though written in 1937, might also have received some attention.

J. CREHAN, S.J.

John Morson, O.C.R., *The Gift of God*, Mercier Press 1952. Pp. 188. 12s 6d.

The sub-title of this book, *A Study of Sanctifying Grace in the New Testament*, indicates its theme and purpose. Father Morson sets out to trace the progressive development of the doctrine of grace as the life of the soul in the books of the New Testament. He confines his investigation to the passages which have a bearing on his theme. His study begins from the Synoptic Gospels, which if not necessarily written first, do embody the earliest catechesis. We are taken next through the Pauline Epistles to the Churches, including *Hebrews*; the *Acts* in relation to St Paul's teaching; the *Epistles* of Sts Peter, James and Jude, and the Pastoral letters of St Paul. A brief excursion is made outside the canonical Scriptures to consider the doctrine of grace in the *Didache* (A.D. 70?) and St Clement's *Epistle to the Corinthians* (A.D. 97?). And lastly, Father Morson examines the Fourth Gospel, with reference to the other Johannine writings. He adopts the reconstruction of the original order of the chapters proposed by the late F. R. Hoare.

This historical method has great advantages. We are introduced to the doctrine of grace not as something static and acquired from the first but as progressively developed and enriched by the inspired writers. We study it not as an abstract synthesis but in its living context from the early controversies on justification and its relation to the Law and Faith to the calmer atmosphere of later years. Gradually the picture is built up of grace as the God-given life of the soul, its effects in the remission of sins and interior sanctification, its relation to God and Christ and the Holy Spirit, its corporate significance, its bearing on the life to come. Sts Paul and John naturally claim the major share of attention, but the contributions of the other Apostolic writers are also stressed. To St Peter we owe the pregnant description

of grace as a participation in the divine life. One is left with a deep impression of the richness, beauty, complexity and vital importance of the life of grace, and a conviction that the New Testament fully bears out the notion of sanctifying grace sanctioned by the teaching Church.

This is a careful study. There is no forcing of the texts. The statement of the doctrine keeps pace with the unfolding of the inspired writer's thought, good summaries are given, and marginal headings continually assist mind and eye in following the trend of the thought. It can be warmly recommended as a textbook for religious instruction on sanctifying grace. We are taken behind concise and abstract dogmatic or catechism formulas to the inspired sources, by a competent guide. One must regretfully add that the printing hardly does justice to the merits of this work. It is of very variable quality, at times faint, at others slightly blurred. Father Morson's study deserves a better presentation.

P. J. MORRIS

Emmaus, Santuario della Manifestazione in Frattione Panis. La Terra Santa, Jerusalem 1953. Pp. 135. Price not stated.

The year 1952 was both a centenary and a golden jubilee for the Franciscan Community serving the sanctuary of el-Qubeibeh. The traditional pilgrimage to the spot had been interrupted in 1687 owing to the hostility of the local inhabitants, and for more than a century and a half it had been considered unwise to recommence it. More peaceful conditions allowed the pious exercise to be again undertaken in 1852, and has continued up to our own days. And fifty years after the recommencement of the annual pilgrimage, the Church built there by the Franciscan Fathers was solemnly consecrated by Cardinal Ferrari, Archbishop of Milan. In 1920 the Holy See honoured this Church by raising it to the rank of a Basilica.

The present volume has been published to commemorate this double anniversary. It consists of eight sections or chapters by as many writers, mostly Franciscan Fathers. The first, by A. Barluzzi, who describes himself as "Architetto", is a *fervorino* on the Gospel account of the journey of the two disciples to Emmaus and of our Lord's manifestation of Himself in "the breaking of bread". There follows a study of considerable interest by Fr D. Baldi on the identification of the Gospel Emmaus. Many have been led to identify it with the village of 'Amwas both by its name and its distance from Jerusalem. It lies about twenty miles from the Holy City near the road leading thence to Jaffa. This distance agrees with the indication

of 160 stadia which is found in some mss. This fact joined with the exclusive possession by the village of a name reminiscent of that mentioned in the Gospel has seemed to some conclusive evidence. But the first element of this proof has now received a fatal blow. It is agreed by the experts in textual criticism that the reading "160 stadia" has no chance of preserving the original words of the Gospel. The few witnesses in which this number occurs are scattered by ones or twos at most among the different classes of mss. And the conclusion to be drawn is stated in the words of the erudite Fr A. Vaccari, S.J. : "The meaning of this is that in no archetype of the great recensions or classes of manuscripts was this reading present ; and this fact in the eyes of the textual critic deprives it of practically all documentary value". The explanation of this number seems to be that some learned person, possibly Origen, whose sojourn in Palestine gave him a knowledge of its localities and whose opinion enjoyed very great authority, was led by the similarity of the name to conclude that the transmission of the text was faulty and so to "correct" it to "160". The similarity of the name cannot stand as evidence alone against a genuine textual reading of 60 stadia equal to a distance of between seven and eight miles.

If 'Amwas was not the site of Christ's manifestation of Himself, the only other serious claimant for the honour is the Franciscan shrine at el-Qubeibeh. This village fulfils the first condition, being of the required distance of 60 stadia from Jerusalem. There is no positive evidence either that it was or that it was not called Emmaus in the first Christian century. There are examples of the same name being shared by different sites. Of this, Bethlehem is a well-known case : one was in the territory of the tribe of Judah, the other in that of the tribe of Zabulon. There are also cases where the ancient name has left no trace, as has happened with Gibeah of Benjamin. No strong argument can therefore be brought against el-Qubeibeh on the score of its purely Arabic name. In favour of the site is the fact ascertained by the results of excavation that the place was inhabited in the first Christian century, an antiquity that had earlier been called in question. Then mention should not be omitted of the house incorporated by the Crusaders in the Church they built on the spot. This indicates that it enjoyed a veneration derived from ancient tradition. The results of the excavations are presented in this book in a form acceptable to the general reader and not with the minuteness expected by the archaeologist. They show that the site was inhabited from the Hellenistic period to the late Roman or early Byzantine. After the Moslem invasion of A.D. 637 local life came to an end, to be re-established centuries later by the Crusaders. The question suggests itself why they should have

fixed on the ruins here as indicating the situation of the Gospel Emmaus unless oral tradition had preserved the memory of the tradition in spite of the authority given by Origen and others to a rival locality. Architectural elements have been found which point to the existence of a Byzantine church, though no foundations of such an edifice have been discovered. This, however, may be due simply to the impossibility of excavating the whole site on account of the presence of buildings and trees, so rare and so valuable in Palestine. A Byzantine church may have been built on the site of the Crusaders' church and its remains concealed by that later construction.

Fr A. Olivan gives an able discussion of the meaning of "the breaking of bread", and comes to the conclusion that in the context it can only have a Eucharistic significance. This conclusion seems to be certainly correct. Fr V. Corbo gives an interesting account of the purchase of the ground from the Moslems—no easy matter, especially as it was undertaken and achieved, though indirectly, by a woman, the Servant of God, Paolina Nicolay. He describes further the legal battle that had to be fought with the newly established Latin Patriarchate in order to achieve her purpose of committing the care of the shrine to the Franciscan Custody of the Holy Land, as they alone had the men and the means to secure its adequate service. There follows an account of the preparatory Seminary established at el-Qubeibeh, with sketches of some of its more celebrated students. Three were martyred by the Turks in their onslaught on the Armenians in 1916 and 1920. The volume closes with a list of the outstanding dates in the history of the recovered property.

There are occasional misprints, as in the name of the architect, Dr Schick, and some passages lack due clarity of expression.

EDMUND F. SUTCLIFFE, S.J.

Richard T. A. Murphy, O.P., *A Commentary on the Psalms of the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin*. The Torch, New York. Pp. 107. \$2.25.

The title of this book is a trifle misleading, as it is a commentary on the Little Office according to the Dominican rite, and this differs notably from the same office in the Roman Breviary. Fr Murphy is a Doctor of Sacred Scripture, but his primary purpose in writing this little work is to provide a devotional commentary. His knowledge of Biblical lands and history, and Biblical matters, forms an unobtrusive but solid background to his comments. The Psalms commented on are Pss. 94, 8, 18, 23, 92, 99, 62, 119 to 130, 109, 112, 147, 131 to 133; and there are also commentaries on the Canticle of the Three Young

Men (Dan. iii.56-88), the Benedictus, the Magnificat and the Nunc Dimittis. There is a short historical and liturgical Introduction to the Office, an outline of the laws of Hebrew parallelism, and prefatory notes on the liturgical meaning of each Hour. The translation of the Psalms is that of the American Confraternity of Christian Doctrine based on the New Psalter.

Fr Murphy had American readers in view, and so we find comparisons drawn between Palestinian and American geographical and climatic conditions. Thus, Palestine is compared to New Mexico or Arizona, its wadis to dry gulches; the Negeb ("southland") conjures up a picture of a "dust-bowl". We find a reference to "teen-agers" in the comments on the Invitatory Psalm (94), the Empire State building soaring unexpectedly in those on Ps. 8, Fords and Cadillacs entering into a brief discussion of the problem of the prosperity of the wicked. But these and other Americana are only incidental and present no difficulty to the English reader nowadays. As will be inferred, there is nothing heavy handed or "stuffy" about the commentary. The spiritual lessons are helpful and modern, and there are passages of quiet beauty which recapture the mood of the Psalm or Canticle. This commentary will be especially useful to those who recite the Little Office according to the Dominican rite, but it may be recommended to a wider circle of readers as a pleasing introduction to the Psalms and as refreshing spiritual reading.

P. J. MORRIS

o
e
l
-
y
.
t
d
e
e
it
-